

Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) Cycle Report

Team Name: Churn Down For What?!?!	Test Owners: Kris Kowalski	Date of Report: 05/08/2017
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Aim Statement:

By September 2017, Riverside County will reduce 1-30 and 31-60 days churn by 15% in the Indio and Jurupa offices, as well as reduce the discontinuance rate by 7% in the Indio office and 15% in the Jurupa office.

Testing Location: *(lobby of main office, ongoing unit 2 at North Street office)*

Jurupa

Test Population: *(next five walk-ins, customers who need to recertify in October)*

Jurupa CF worker's Mirna Sanchez and Michael Jones RE's. Control group was Erendida De Leon and Victoria McCain.

First Day of Test:

03/01/2017

Last Day of Test:

03/21/2017

Plan

We plan to... *(who, what, when, where, what data are to be collected)*

We are trying to collect data on the number of customers who answer for their first interview when a pink reminder appointment letter is being mailed to the customer the week prior to their interview taking place.

In order to... *(learn if change idea has merit, if the test addresses the problem)*

We are doing this in order to see if the reminder letters give us a lower no show rate than we were previously experiencing in the hopes that this will lower our discontinuance and churn rates.

Prediction... *(test will yield a reduction in no-shows from 30 percent to 20 percent)*

Our prediction is that the letter will help us attain a no show rate of less than 25%.

Do

Describe how the test was actually performed... *(who, what, when, where)*

April RE appointments were set up timely in March for distribution with the RE packets on 3/15/17. The appointment letter that corresponds to the packet was printed separately and sorted by the week of the interview (i.e. 4/3-4/7, 4/10-4/14, 4/17-4/20). These appointment letters were printed on bright pink paper and mailed out the Monday of the week prior to their interview (mail dates were 3/27, 4/3, and 4/10) as a reminder to the customer that their interview was scheduled for the following week.

The customer was called at their scheduled appointment time and all data was tracked on the monthly trackers ET's were using to organize their work. If the customer answered and completed the interview or answered and stated they received the letter but needed to reschedule they were counted as showing for the interview. If the customer did not answer at all and a NOMI was sent they were considered a no show. All interviews were scheduled prior to the end of ten day notice so the data was only collected until 4/20.

Team Name: Churn Down For What?!?!	Test Owners: Kris Kowalski	Date of Report: 05/08/2017
Study		

Describe your data and results...

Qualitatively for the second month in a row we received good feedback on the appointment letter reminders. Some customers did indicate to their ET they appreciated the reminder or did not know about the interview until the letter was received. This information is hard to quantify but anecdotally does help us understand that the reminder helped.

Quantitatively we can see that the letters were an overall success. Mirna had 35/48 interviews answers while Michael had 35/45 for a combined total of 75% which was our target area rate for showing. These are encouraging numbers based on our internal past experiences in this environment.

Our control group yielded wildly different results from the test group and each other. Victoria completed 28/45 interviews for a 62% average which is what we typically see. Erendida however has an answer rate of 80% as 42/52 people answered while not receiving any reminder letter. This is an extremely high rate for any monthly workload and one we would not expect to be replicated over time. This led to our control group having a 72% answer rate which is not much lower than our test group.

Describe what you learned from your data...

With this round of data I think we confirmed that there is a steadily higher rate of customers who answer when an appointment letter is sent rather than when one is not. While the overall numbers in terms of percentages are very close between the control and test group we can see that the control group had wildly different outcomes with the numbers between them. We believe that it would not be prudent to take the 80% answer rate from Erendida as a fact and should possibly test more to get a better overall average between the two groups.

Explain how your findings compared to your predictions, including any surprises...

The biggest surprise was our 80% answer rate. Most staff would agree that this is not a normal number and something we should not expect on a regular basis. The previous month had a worker carrying a similar caseload as Erendida and she had a 57% answer rate.

Act

What we plan to do next is... *(adopt the idea, adapt the test and do another cycle, abandon the idea)*

As an office we need to look at possibly using the whole office as a test where we split half with reminder letters and half without to see if there are any discernable differences on a much larger scale.

Very important that reminder Letter be in a BRIGHT color